

1 The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was *not* written  
2 for publication and is *not* binding precedent of the Board

3  
4 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

5  
6  
7 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
8 AND INTERFERENCES  
9

10  
11 *Ex parte* PATRICK THOMAS O'CONNOR and DONALD REX BOYS  
12

13  
14 Appeal 2007-0609  
15 Application 09/814,010<sup>1</sup>  
16 Technology Center 3600  
17

18  
19 Decided: February 28, 2007  
20

21  
22 *Before:* HUBERT C. LORIN, STUART S. LEVY, and ROBERT E.  
23 NAPPI, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

24  
25 LEVY, *Administrative Patent Judge.*  
26

27  
28 ORDER REMANDING TO THE EXAMINER  
29

30 STATEMENT OF CASE

31 Applicants appeal from a final rejection of claims 35 and 36 under 35  
32 U.S.C. § 134 (2002). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

---

<sup>1</sup> Application filed March 20, 2001. Applicants claim the benefit under 35 U.S.C. § 120 of application 09/323,599, filed June 1, 1999. The real party in interest is Patrick Thomas O'Connor and Donald Rex Boys.

1           The Examiner rejected claims 35 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)  
2           (2004).

3           Claim 35 is representative of the claims under appeal and reads as  
4           follows:

5           35.   An Internet-enabled appointment and reservation service  
6           system, comprising:  
7  
8                   an Internet-connected appointment/reservation server executing  
9           first software; and

10  
11                   one or more subscribing businesses to the service, the  
12           businesses each having an internet-connected appliance executing  
13           second software;

14  
15                   wherein the appointment server, through the first software,  
16           presents to browsing clients an interactive interface enabling the  
17           clients to select individual ones of the subscribing businesses, and  
18           once a subscribing business is selected displays to the selecting client  
19           an interactive appointment/reservation schedule to select an  
20           appointment or reservation with the business, wherein the  
21           appointment server updates the appointment/reservation schedule at  
22           the server for each business as browsing clients make  
23           appointments/reservations, wherein the appointment/reservation  
24           server periodically provides updated appointment schedules to the  
25           subscribing businesses which are displayed by the second software  
26           interactively, allowing the subscribing businesses to further update the  
27           appointment reservation schedules and to return them to the  
28           appointment/reservation server, which updated versions then becomes  
29           the interactive schedules displayed to browsing clients.

1 The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on  
2 appeal is:

3 DeLorme	US 5,948,004	Sep. 7, 1999
4 Cummings, Jr.	US 6,345,260 B1	Feb. 5, 2002

5  
6 From our review of the record, we find that the application is not in  
7 condition for decision on appeal for the reasons which follow. Accordingly,  
8 we remand the application to the Examiner to take appropriate action.

9  
10 **ISSUE**

11 A page is missing from the Examiner's Answer.

12  
13 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

14  
15 The Examiner's Answer includes pages numbered 1-7 and 9  
16 (excluding the Appendix). Page 9 has been renumbered "8" in ink.  
17 However, the language at the end of page 7 does not correlate with the  
18 language at the top of page 9 (renumbered in ink as "8").

19  
20 **ANALYSIS**

21 From the inconsistent language bridging the bottom of page 7 and the  
22 top of page 9, which had been renumbered as "8," we conclude that a page is  
23 missing from the Examiner's Answer. Correction is required.

1           This remand to the examiner pursuant to 37 CFR § 41.50(a)(1)  
2 (effective September 13, 2004, is ***not*** made for further consideration of a  
3 rejection. Accordingly, 37 CFR § 41.50(a)(2) does not apply.

4

5                               REMAND TO THE EXAMINER

6

7   hh

8

9

10

11   *CENTRAL COAST PATENT AGENCY, INC.*

12   *3 HANGAR WAY SUITE D*

13   *WATSONVILLE, CA 95076*